

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11 and 13-15 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 11 is amended in order to clarify the language of the claim and not to overcome prior art.

Entry of the amendment is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendment: (a) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration; (b) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Satisfy Formal Matters

The Office Action objects to claim 11 based on formal matters. Claim 11 is amended to obviate the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claim 11 is respectfully requested.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Rowe (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,301); and rejects claims 3, 4, 8, 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rowe in view of Weideman (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,519). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Neither Rowe, nor Weideman, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests at least summary data including information showing which page contains what contents of information such that a user can select a specific page that includes contents of information of interest to the user, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

The Office Action, at page 3, pieces together various features disclosed in Rowe in order to anticipate the features recited in independent claims 1 and 6. However, the features that are pieced together by the Office Action, and not Rowe, do not operate in a manner

asserted in the Office Action. Furthermore, the combination of the features pieced together by the Office Action do not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of the claims.

The Office Action asserts that Rowe's table of contents or bookmarks (disclosed at col. 11, lines 45 and Fig. 2a) discloses the claimed summary data. The Office Action further asserts that Rowe's page content information (disclosed at col. 3, lines 46-48 and lines 55-57) discloses the feature "information showing which page contains what contents of information." Then, the Office Action concludes that the combination of Rowe's table of contents or bookmarks, and page content information discloses the feature "summary data including information showing which page contains what contents of information."

On the contrary, nowhere does Rowe disclose or suggest that the page content information is included in Rowe's table of contents or bookmarks. Rather, as disclosed in Fig. 2a and at col. 11, lines at col. 4, Rowe discloses that the table of contents or bookmarks 45 are particular portions of a document that a user has selected and marked with text. Rowe further discloses that different chapter headings can be displayed as labels in a bookmark 45 so that when a user selects a chapter, the first page of that chapter is displayed. See col. 11, lines 56-59. In other words, there is simply no teachings or suggestions in Rowe that the bookmarks 45 include information showing which page contains what contents of information.

The Office Action recognizes the deficiency of Rowe's table of contents or bookmarks 45, and attempts to supplement the deficiency by introducing Rowe's page content information. As discussed above, Rowe is silent as to include the page content information in Rowe's table of contents or bookmarks 45. Instead, Rowe discloses that the page content information is written in the optimized document file. See col. 3, lines 46-48.

The Office Action draws a mislead conclusion regarding the characteristics of the page content information because at col. 3, lines 46-47, Rowe discloses that the page content

information describes individual pages of a document. Based on this disclosure, the Office Action at page 3 concludes that the page content information discloses the feature "information showing which page contains what contents of information." This conclusion is not correct.

At col. 6, lines 47-54, Rowe discloses that the page content information specifies "the appearance of each page of the document," and "any aspect of the appearance of a designated first page of the document at the beginning of the optimized electronic document...." Nowhere does Rowe disclose or suggest that the page content information specifies information showing which page contains what contents of information, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Thus, even if Rowe's table of contents or bookmarks are combined with Rowe's page content information, the combination does not disclose or suggest summary data including information showing which page contains what contents of information. Because, Rowe does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned feature of the claims, Rowe does not disclose or suggest summary data including information showing which page contains what contents of information such that a user can select a specific page that includes contents of information of interest to the user, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

Weideman does not compensate for the deficiencies of Rowe.

Furthermore, none of the applied references disclose or suggest a user terminal for transmitting a page data transmission request through a ground-based network and page data transmitting means for transmitting specific page data contained in the specific document data to the user terminal through a satellite network, as recited in independent claim 9. Weideman discloses a satellite communication system for coupling a user terminal to a data communications network. However, Weideman does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 9.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 6 and 9 define patentable subject matter. Claims 3-5, 8-9, 11 and 13-15 depend on the respective independent claims, and therefore also define patentable subject matter as well as for the other features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/hs

Date: October 12, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|